

SPEECH

22

OF

ION. ISAAC E. MORSE, OF LOUISIANA,

ON THE

PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE IN RELATION TO CALIFORNIA.

DELIVERED

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, MARCH 14, 1850.

---

WASHINGTON:

PRINTED AT THE CONGRESSIONAL GLOBE OFFICE.

1850.





## THE SLAVE QUESTION.

---

a Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union, on the President's Message transmitting the Constitution of California.

Mr. MORSE said:

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The importance of the question under consideration will be the only apology I offer for asking a share of the attention of the committee.

The debate which has been going on for some time in this body and the Senate, has left little for those who follow, but the gleanings of a field once as rich as the mines of that California whose admission into our Union is the subject of the Executive message now lying upon your table. May our acquisitions in that quarter not prove like the golden fruit of the East, beautiful to the eye, but useless to the taste.

The whole history of this California question is more the appearance of romance than of truth, and it is only from fable or fiction that we can draw a parallel. Where, but in the mythological story of Minerva, springing armed from the head of Jove himself, do we find anything to illustrate her present position?—a sovereign State as large as the island of "thirteen," with nine hundred miles of seaboard, her two Senators, and two Representatives in this branch, with their constitution in their hands, stepping from the brain of a brigadier-general of the United States army, into this Union of confederated sovereignties.

Had you but provided her with the decent veil of a short territorial government at the last session of Congress, I see nothing that would have prevented her from being admitted under the operation of your "*previous question*;" but when it has been so often and so solemnly announced upon this floor, and by the resolutions of a large number of State Legislatures, as the settled and avowed policy that, henceforth and forever, from now to eternity, no other slave territory shall be incorporated into this Union, the question assumes an air of grave importance, and it becomes every statesman to look narrowly and carefully at it, and to see whether, if that be the settled policy, as avowed by some gentlemen, boldly, fully, and honestly, and entertained by nearly every Representative from the States North of Mason and Dixon's line, it does not become the duty of the people of the South to see how far their interests are endangered and their principles compromised, under this modern reckless and majority interpretation of the Constitution. I am not of

that class of men who desire to put off until tomorrow the business of to-day. I propose, then, sir, briefly to examine the "*signs of the times*;" what is the present feeling North and South; and whether the South are guilty of aggression upon the rights of the North, or whether the North has or has not encroached upon the South—to look upon the remedy proposed by the southern States—to examine coolly and dispassionately the relative advantages of the Union. I am not to be seduced from the even tenor of my way by the siren songs of hosannas to the Union, nor am I to be deterred by the yelpings and howlings of those who choose to call me agitator or disunionist.

When our forefathers framed this Constitution, they declared, that, "We, the people of the United States, in order to form a more perfect Union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquillity, provide for the common defence, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and posterity, do ordain," &c., &c.

Each and all of that posterity have not only the right, but their duty to those who come after them requires that they should see whether this compact is faithfully kept; and a man who cannot speak is a fool, who will not speak is a bigot, and who is afraid to speak is a slave.

I shall come, however, to that portion of my argument (if my time allows) last.

Before I begin, I desire to disembarass this question from all extraneous matter—to set some gentlemen right upon the subject, by denying once for all, that slavery is an evil, and that anybody has any right to remedy it as such. This most mischievous error has grown up from the sentiments of Mr. Jefferson, and many other southern statesmen, hastily and imprudently expressed at an early period of our country; also from the objections made to slavery by some of the southern States. Whatever might have been the sentiment of the people of the South then, it has undergone a great change. We have seen our country flourish under this system—a tropical climate and soil (where the white man cannot cultivate the earth, without incurring more or less risk of health or life) converted into a terrestrial paradise.

We have seen grow up with this institution a noble, chivalrous, and intelligent people, who have always exercised, and (without meaning to be at all offensive) will continue to exercise, in the affairs of the world and of this country, an influence fully equal to our numerical strength.

Without intending to disparage, in the least de-



gree, our brethren of any portion of this great domain, I do not hesitate to say, that in the peaceful walks of civil life—in the stirring events of war—in everything that can adorn and elevate a man, the people of the South are fully your equals, and being completely satisfied with all our institutions, we do not desire, or intend to allow, any change in any one of them.

I ask you, Mr. Chairman, is it not true that the people of one half of these States have discussed seriously, or are now discussing, the propriety of meeting in Convention at Nashville, to see what steps are necessary to be taken to secure their honor and their constitutional rights, which they say, or think, are both endangered.

I agree with my friend from Georgia, [Mr. TOOMBS,] that up to 1820 there was no great cause of complaint. The people of the North and South lived like a band of brothers, and the stars and stripes floated over one people.

Is it so now? I will not weaken the argument of the Senator from South Carolina, [Mr. CALHOUN,] in regard to the separation of the churches, North and South. When, I ask, was it seen before, that Christians cannot bow before the same altar, and worship together that God, who commands us to love our neighbor as ourself—when before have you heard of the resolutions of one State having been sent back in contempt, because they contained insulting and offensive matter. Our children are not educated, as formerly, in the northern colleges—traveling has greatly diminished—the pulpit, the press, this Hall—ay, the Senate, where grave old men were wont to talk calmly and wisely—now hear constant and continued fulminations of one portion of the American people against the other. These things cannot last and the Union continue. Why, if no legislative enactments of an offensive character were ever passed, the indulgence of their feelings will ultimately estrange these parties. This Union has not unappropriately been compared to that most beautiful and holy union of the sexes, which our Creator instituted; but when mutual love and respect are gone—when that mysterious sentiment, which is not only the spirit, but the substance of the contract, is gone—the rest is a worthless and insulting mockery.

When, Mr. Chairman, in the history of the last thirty years, has it ever been remarked before, that CLAY, CALHOUN and WEBSTER agreed upon any one question, as we have seen from their late speeches, they do upon the *open violation* of the Constitution, in relation to the rendition of fugitive slaves. Speaking, sir, in legal parlance, they agree entirely upon the facts and the law. It is true, they differ widely about the remedy, as would naturally have been supposed from their respective localities, the temper of the men, and the character of the people they represent; but all three agree that the North, by refusing to surrender up fugitive slaves, violate both the letter and spirit of the Constitution; and all urge, not only the justice, but the absolute necessity, of enforcing that provision, and repealing the laws which in many of the States render it inoperative. If, under these circumstances, the three master minds of America have so little influence or control that they cannot arrest this evil, then indeed is the disease organic, and too deeply seated for the ordinary remedies.

If the light of three such minds (which, like the expiring flicker of the lamp, seems to burn brighter, before it is forever extinguished, and whose great genius and patriotism we may never see united again) cannot penetrate the gloom that veils the future, and do what I know they all desire to save this Union, we must look to some higher source—“*ne quid detrimenti Respublica capiat*.” I regret to be obliged to differ from the distinguished Senator from Kentucky, [Mr. CLAY,] whose name never fails to recall the association of eminent talents, great aims, and a long career of public service, who seems to appreciate too lightly the dangers which menace this Union, and whose great weight I am afraid will be thrown again to the South.

It neither suits my taste nor temper to pursue this unpleasant recital further. From all I see and hear, and read, and feel—an instinct which rarely deceives me—tells me that there is danger of great danger—to the Union, and to the Constitution of my country, which God, in his infinite mercy, will avert. It is not by eloquent appeals, and beautiful eulogies upon the Union, that it can be saved—let it be so by such expressions as a determination to stand by the Union, proviso or no proviso. When gentlemen from the South indulge in similar expressions, they are more dangerous to what we conceive the best interests of the South than the most ultra men of the North—when you say, “*coram deo*,” what will, you stand by the Union, you invite aggression. It may be of little moment to you whether you lose your hat or your cane, but let it be known that you will not resist—then you are a lover of peace—men will soon be found ready and willing to trespass upon your rights and put an indignity upon your person; much less can the Union be saved by the course of the northern and metropolitan press, hitherto remarkable for a frank statement of the true “*signs of the times*”—not by concealing the true state of the public mind at the South—not by publishing garbled portions of the messages of our governors or the resolutions of our State legislatures, with here and there a solitary article upon the value of this Union, as though there was some cabalistic meaning of the word, that could cover up and atone for every sin. No, sir. Let the truth be spoken far and wide. Let it be known that there is a large portion of the American people discontented, who are ready and willing to renounce all old party associations, and are anxious to meet their fellow-citizens of the southern States in convention at Nashville, in the month of June next. A majority of the southern States have made preparations already to be represented—probably nearly every State will be; and whatever may be the decision of that convention, every southern State, with perhaps one or two exceptions, for weal or for woe, will make one common cause. Notwithstanding the *IO!* ejaculation and bitter denunciation of disunion by the Senator from Texas, that State has made the legal and necessary arrangements to be represented, and further, refused to vote instructions to her delegates to use all their influence to prevent a dissolution of the Union. Let us understand each other, and talk like men, as no disease was ever avoided by concealing the danger, or cured by wishing the patient well; so neither discontent nor disunion will be prevented or cured by lauding the glories of



the Union, or threatening to drive the traitors into the Cumberland river.

I propose briefly, then, to examine the second proposition: Who are the aggressors?

To do so, understandingly, let us see what was the relative position of the people North and South upon this question, and see who have advanced, and who have retreated.

The first hostile movement was made when Missouri applied to be admitted into the Union. After five months of angry discussion, that State was admitted, and the Missouri compromise passed—that is, when the people, authorized to form a constitution, having all the constitutional rights to be admitted into this Union, presented themselves with their constitution, they were refused admittance, until the South consented to establish the imaginary line of  $36^{\circ} 30'$  north of which they forever bound themselves and their posterity not to go with their slaves, while their northern brethren might go north or south. There was the fatal error of the people of the South. They should never have conceded the jurisdiction to Congress on the subject. They should have resisted, at every hazard (as they must do at some time or other) every attempt to prevent them from going, when they please, where they please, and with what property they please, into any and all the territory of the United States, every acre, every foot—ay, every spoonful of which—was the community property.

The country, however, remained comparatively quiet until about fifteen years ago. Still there was no great uneasiness felt, until the admission of Texas into the Union. You, Mr. Chairman, and I, were members of the twenty-eighth Congress, and recollect the discussion that took place. Let me read an extract or two from the speeches of northern men upon this subject:

“Yes, sir, I repeat, hypocritical pretences! What, the ministers of the liberty-loving Government of Great Britain, so impressed with the horrors of human servitude in Texas and the United States, as to interpose their benevolent policy in our affairs, as an act of pure philanthropy! No person, at all acquainted with English history and policy, and who has learned even a tithe of the suffering of the millions upon millions of human beings held in abject and intolerable slavery throughout her vast dominions, can fail for a moment to read this” painted hypocrite

‘Through the disguise she wears.’

“Look at England herself. In the distance, like the whitened sepulchre, she looks splendid—beautiful. Approach her; enter her cold and dismal mines; then behold slavery—half-clad, half-starved, pale, emaciated slavery—in the shape of human beings, compelled to ceaseless servitude, the doomed and wretched vassals of the very lords and earls who prattle so loudly upon the floor of Parliament about the horrors of American slavery. Enter her manufacturing towns and cities; see the ragged and wan husband and father, struggling early and late for a mere pittance. Visit the wife and children in the miserable and dirty hovel, enduring all the horrors bordering upon nudity and starvation; and then call to mind, that all this is the direct effect of the oppressive and grinding policy of these pretended philanthropists for the negro race in America. But we need not stop here. True, she freed her slaves in the West Indies. For what purpose? not of a hatred to slavery! From a sincere desire to relieve human suffering? Or was it to foment the spirit of *political abolitionism* in the United States, to array the North against the South, and thus to weaken the ties that bind us together, and finally consummate her long-cherished desires, by a *dissolution of our Union*, and prostrate forever her great and rival antagonist in commerce, manufactures, and the arts.”

You, Mr. Chairman, heard all that discussion—you saw all their fire-brand resolutions voted down and denounced by northern men. I need not say

to you, that was the way the Democracy of the North, and many of the intelligent Whigs, voted. You know who stood by the Atherton resolutions, and all such resolutions as would give peace and quiet to the South. Let me show the committee how northern States—at least northern Democratic States—acted. While the Texan annexation was under discussion, a member of this House, from New Hampshire, wrote and published a long letter to his constituents, assigning his reasons for deserting his party on this question, and put forth an anti-slavery manifesto. You recollect in what unmeasured terms he was denounced by one of his colleagues. I will not offend the committee by reading the insinuations made against the veracity of his address. Suffice it to say, that no gentleman, born and brought up south of Mason and Dixon’s line, would ever have preserved friendly relations afterward, without some satisfaction.

The author of that address had been nominated as a candidate for reëlection to this body by the entire Democracy of the State, (because, at that time, New Hampshire had not adopted the district system of electing her members of Congress,) and though it was within a few weeks, if I remember accurately, of the time of the election, and at an inclement season of the year, a convention was called for the entire State, the nomination was cancelled, another person was substituted in his place, and from that day JOHN P. HALE has ceased all connection with the Democratic party. True it is, that by a union of the Whigs and Abolitionists, he was elected a Senator; and the colleague who denounced him, and the author of the speech, the extract of which I have just read, is—who do you suppose, Mr. Chairman? why, MOSES NORRIS, his co-Senator!

Where are the eloquent defenders of the South—no, sir; not of the South, but the fearless exponents of the Constitution? Where are the Browns? the Ingersolls? the Athertons? the Norrises and Ellises? and echo answers, “Where.” All have been compelled to turn their coats like HALE and NORRIS, or one by one have been stricken down, or forced into voluntary exile from public life.

The committee will pardon me if I read one short extract from the speech of an able member from New York, the Empire State, with thirty-four members upon this floor, and but one solitary spared monument of the defenders of the Constitution:

“Let the scheme declare, as the bill of my colleague, [Mr. ROBINSON,] the predecessor of my friend before me, from New York [Mr. DOR] proposes, that after forming one slave State, slavery shall be prohibited in all the other States which the territory may hereafter make, unless Congress shall otherwise determine by law, and you drive Texas into indignant rejection. You make a fundamental provision which, if adopted, would be an unfailing source of agitation, of contention—perhaps of *disunion* itself. The spirit of political abolitionism would rejoice in triumph. It would hold a power over the action of some members of Congress hereafter, whose faces it would knead into dough. You would effectually imprison the slave race within those prescribed limits of the Union, close the drain and the outlet to Mexico, and most surely perpetuate the existence of slavery under the pretence of extending the area of freedom.”

Such then, Mr. Chairman, were the sentiments of all liberal men at the North. I hope to hear no more of the aggressions of the South, or the slaveocracy, as we have it classically expressed. The idea of a party in a minority of more than forty members, on this floor, aggressing upon the rights of the majority, is as ridiculous as would be the



attempt of a weak, sickly man, to encroach upon the privileges of a strong, herculean neighbor. If you mean to carry out the opinions entertained by nearly all men of all parties, and restrict us to our present limits, and forbid us from ever extending ourselves and our institutions, say that you have become more righteous, or that you understand the Constitution better, or what you please, but do not charge us with aggressing upon your rights. How can we aggress upon your rights? We cannot pass a solitary measure without a large vote from the North, if all the Representatives from the slave States were united. Can you name a single instance where the South have endeavored to interfere with the domestic affairs of the North? If you will strike out of your proviso the word "slavery," and insert any other substantive in the English language, there is not a man, woman, or child, but would rise up and denounce it. Say that the Catholic religion, or the Methodist religion, the common law, or the civil law, shall not go to California, and there would be a denunciation from one end of the Union to the other. It is true that the Wilmot proviso, *eo nomine*, is defunct. I was sitting in that gallery when it was introduced, and a gentleman observed to me that it was the worst firebrand ever introduced, and would dissolve the Union, and we both went into the House, and voted against it.

The people of the South relying upon their constitutional rights, are committed against this Wilmot proviso, and you will not pass it. When the Constitution was framed, the people of the South had intelligence and foresight enough to make such constitutional provisions as were necessary to secure them from any encroachments. We think those provisions sufficient, and are willing to trust ourselves under that Constitution when faithfully executed; but I desire to say for myself, without intending or wishing to commit any gentlemen to my views, that as it is admitted by northern men, jurists, and all writers and commentators upon the Constitution, that without these guaranties, the Union could never have been formed; if it shall be shown by the legislation and practice of this Government, that they are not sufficient to secure all the rights of property in slaves in *esse posse, manendo et eundo*, I desire to have additional guaranties.

Mr. McCLERNAND wished to know whether the gentleman intended to exert his influence to cause the southern States to secede, or break up the Union, if they do not get an amendment to the Constitution?

Mr. MORSE. If those guaranties are not sufficient, or are not maintained, I will devote all my energy, day and night—I will write and talk to the people to bring this about. My people, in giving up the right to go north of 36° 30', will at least have the doctrine of non-intervention respected south of that line. I believe the guaranties of the Constitution amply sufficient, and am willing to submit the question to the courts of justice.

Mr. McCLERNAND. The gentleman says that, if such and such things are not done, he is for disunion. He insists that slavery is tolerated south of 36° 30'. Now the gentleman, holding the doctrine he does, I ask him, in view of that doctrine, how can he contend that non-intervention can prevent him?

Mr. MORSE. It cannot.

Mr. McCLERNAND. What is the difficulty, then?

Mr. MORSE. Because you declare in all your speeches and preambles, and will probably do so in some legislative enactment, that slavery shall not go there, or that it is forever excluded by Mexican law. The moment you do, you violate the bond, tear your name from it, and seek to hold us to it.

Mr. McCLERNAND. You said the Wilmot proviso was defunct.

Mr. MORSE. True; but there are two other provisos, the Executive, and, the most *odious* of all, the *Mexican proviso*, as I shall call it—"a rose by any other name"—the quotation is somewhat musty.

Mr. DUER. If the judiciary decides against you, will you then insist on your proposed change in the Constitution?

Mr. MORSE. No, sir; I would abide by that decision—you cannot make your Mexican proviso any more palatable. If I am to be excluded from the country, where you said solemnly we had a right to go, I would rather you should do it than the Mexicans.

The legislative and the treaty-making power are both subservient to the Constitution, and no law—no treaty can bind any citizen that contravenes that sacred instrument. The President and the Senate cannot make any treaty in defiance of this Constitution. If a stipulation had been inserted, either by the commissioners or in the Senate, (as I learn was attempted,) that slavery could not go to every part of the territory south of 36° 30', it would not be worth the parchment on which it was written, and I would go there, as I have no doubt we have a right to do with our slaves, and if there was an honest judge to be found, (any man except one who thinks that he is justified in violating his oath because the Constitution is subservient to the laws of God,) I would hold your treaty null and void, and I should be protected in the enjoyment of my slave property. Could your President and Senate make a treaty establishing a Church as a part of your State government? Could your Senate make a treaty recognizing a title of nobility? In short, can it do anything forbidden, or even doubtful, under your Constitution?

Well, what is the force of this *Mexican proviso*? I have read all the writers upon national law, and I find nothing of the kind, and I regret that a Senator from Pennsylvania has Vattel in the original from the library, or I would show what the law on the subject is. I will however state, that all that any writer contends for, is, that the people shall not be left lawless, and that such municipal laws and regulations as are necessary, are (*ex necessitate rei*) left in force until the laws or will of the conquering power is known. Our Constitution is sovereign, and extends *instantly* over all territory acquired in any manner whatever, and annuls and abrogates all laws repugnant to it. An established religion is part of the law of Mexico. Is there such a thing in these territories now? There are fifty articles, contraband by the Mexican law, now going in free. Have you ever extended even your revenue laws over these people? How are all these things done? Because our Constitution extends there, and provides for all the legislation therein contained, either the positive or the prohibitive enactments. I presume there may be



laws formerly in force, that have a binding operation now, where they do not contravene our Constitution, or, it may be, our acts of Congress.

While on the subject of this proviso, I must here say, that if any doubt had ever rested upon my mind, the able argument of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. DISNEY,] has placed that question beyond a controversy. It was even more satisfactory than that of the distinguished statesman from Michigan; and when your inexorable hammer fell, I was both sorry and glad—sorry to have so able an argument interrupted, and glad not to hear the gentleman show how this thing could be done in another way. If he would bring to bear half the research he has shown upon the Wilmot proviso, I know that he would be satisfied that this notion of the Mexican law doing what the Congress of the United States cannot, and will not do, is equally erroneous, unjust, and forty times more offensive than the other.\*

Mr. Chairman, is it necessary to say anything more to prove that these ideas of interfering with slavery in the territories—of the right of Congress to exclude any portion of the American people from carrying their property to all parts of the United States—or the last position, that there is no right of property recognized in slaves—are all of very recent origin? Only a few years ago, Mr. Van Buren, the present head of the Free-Soil party, while representing our Government at the court of St. James, made an able argument, and succeeded in obtaining indemnity for slaves liberated by the English authorities at Nassau; and the only real difficulty was, where their value was to be estimated.

Has it come to this, that we will threaten, with the power of our country, a foreigner who interferes with the slave of our fellow-citizen, but are unable to make our own citizens respect the rights of property of each other, or obey the clear, undisputed requisitions of the Constitution? Then it was true, that the flag of our country protected all her citizens alike? If the person or property of the humblest of our fellow-citizens from the North is molested by the most powerful nation of the earth, our pulse beats quicker at the recital of the injury, and thousands of swords are ready to leap from their scabbards to right the wrong; but when it has relation to slave property, not only will you not demand and obtain redress, but you aid, abet, and shield the perpetrators of such wrong among our brethren.

Since the period when Mr. Van Buren obtained compensation for the slaves liberated at Nassau, one or two other vessels have been obliged to stop there, under precisely the same circumstances, and the slaves have been liberated, and the injury has

\*Since the above remarks were made, the conclusion of Mr. DISNEY's speech has been published in the *Globe*, from which I make the following extract:

"The present Executive has been pledged for the proviso, as against it in the South, but as in favor of it in the North; and my constituents believe, that this was an atrocious fraud; they think its exposure is demanded by the highest interests of the Republic; and they say to me, that though Congress may have no legal power to make such a provision an effective law, yet

"Wrest once the law to our authority,

To do a great right, do a little wrong,"

And bring these pledges to the test, I feel that they are right, and shall obey."

Comment is unnecessary.

remained unredressed. Are the laws so equally and impartially administered, and the benefits and protection so justly meted out, that unless we are ready to declare that we are for the Union, now, and forever, and under all circumstances, we are to be denounced as factionists?

I solemnly declare that there is no man more devoted to the Union of these States than myself, and I know that great injuries, inconveniences, and unfortunate consequences will necessarily follow to all sections from a separation. I say more, that I do not think there is a man in my State in favor of disunion, as an abstract idea, but that there are things even more to be avoided than disunion, and that any attempt to destroy the institution of slavery in the States directly, or by circumscribing it to limits too narrow, or by keeping us out of all territory south of 36° 30', will as surely, as day succeeds night, bring about that catastrophe; and upon the heads of those who are guilty of such aggression will the sin remain.

When I invoke your aid, under the Constitution, for the protection and return of my slave property, I am not answered, when you tell me that it is a local law that constitutes slavery. A distinguished statesman—perhaps the most distinguished statesman of New England, who, for more than fifty years, filled the highest places in her councils, [Mr. ADAMS]—said, that the Constitution was a pro-slavery instrument, and that it contained some two or three clauses inserted for its perpetuation. And if the people of the South hear statesmen appealing to some higher power beyond and above it, they may well feel alarmed and insecure, and think about disunion.

And this brings me to the remedy proposed. One would have supposed, from the manner the convention proposed to be held at Nashville has been denounced, that such a thing had never taken place before. If a single interest, belonging to some portion of this Union, is supposed to be injuriously affected, or threatened, forthwith conventions are held, resolutions passed, and for weeks and months our tables are flooded with pamphlets, upon the subject of coal, iron, or manufactures, as the case may be. There have been more meetings, and preachings, and resolutions passed, and propositions offered, to secede from the Union, and money spent to get rid of the sin and the property, which is ours, than we shall be able to equal in the next ten years, if we do nothing but agitate this question.

When this convention meets at Nashville, I do not suppose it can, or will even attempt to, dissolve the Union. It cannot be done in a day, or a month, or a year; but—as we have already been told by the great statesman from Carolina—already a number of the cords have been sundered, and the last one may be easily broken. It was the last feather that crushed the camel, and the last drop that made the cup run over; and if you will not look at the truth now, the work may be done before you are aware of it. There will be assembled the delegates from a large majority of the southern States, with every disposition to be calm and conservative; they will have to deliberate and talk about the wrongs and aggressions of which they complain. It matters little whether these aggressions exist in truth or in imagination. If only imaginary, like the disease of the hypochondriac, the mental is worse than the bodily, for "who



can minister to a mind diseased?" Is it to be supposed, Mr. Chairman, that the meeting of this convention, under these circumstances, will be calculated to allay the irritation under which the southern mind is laboring? I apprehend not. What remains then to be done? Take away all cause for the convention—show some of the patriotism which belonged to the earlier and better days of the Republic—make us feel that we are the descendants of those who shed their blood in a common cause, and for a common benefit. Let the palladium of an American citizen be at least as

sure a protection as it was in the palmyest days of the Roman Republic. Let the time come, and always be, when the stars and stripes will protect every American, and his property of every kind and description whatever, upon every foot of soil, won by common blood and treasure, so long as you shall hold it in trust for him. In short, give us at least the guaranties which your fathers gave to mine, when they were equals: a strong but generous majority would give more, and save the Union; a weak but jealous minority could not take less, and preserve their honor.